arXiv:1610.00306v2 [math.OC] 18 Dec 2016

A two-phase strategy for control constrained elliptic optimal control problems

Xiaoliang Song* Bo Yu†

December 20, 2016

Abstract

Elliptic optimal control problems with pointwise box constraints on the control (EOCP) are considered. To solve EOCP, the primal-dual active set (PDAS) method, which is a special semismooth Newton (SSN) method, used to be a priority in consideration of their locally superlinear convergence. However, in general solving the Newton equations is expensive, especially when the discretization is in a fine level. Motivated by the success of applying alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) for solving large scale convex minimization problem in finite dimension, it is reasonable to extend the ADMM to solve EOCP. To numerically solve EOCP, the finite element (FE) method is used for discretization. Then, a two-phase strategy is presented to solve discretized problems. In Phase-I, an inexact heterogeneous ADMM (ihADMM) is proposed with the aim of solving discretized problems to moderate accuracy or using it to generate a reasonably good initial point to warm-start Phase-II. Different from the classical ADMM, our ihADMM adopts two different weighted inner product to define the augmented Lagrangian function in two subproblems, respectively. Benefiting from such different weighted techniques, two subproblems of ihADMM can be efficiently implemented. Furthermore, theoretical results on the global convergence as well as the iteration complexity results $o(1/k)$ for ihADMM are given. In Phase-II, in order to obtain more accurate solution, the primal-dual active set (PDAS) method is used as a postprocessor of the ihADMM. Numerical results show that the ihADMM and the two-phase strategy are highly efficient.

Keywords: optimal control; finite element; inexact heterogeneous ADMM; semismooth Newton

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the following linear-quadratic elliptic PDE-constrained optimal control problems with box constraints on the control:

$$\begin{cases} \min\limits_{(y,u)\in Y\times U} & J(y,u)=\dfrac{1}{2}\|y-y_d\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}+\dfrac{\alpha}{2}\|u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ \text{s.t.} & Ly=u+y_c \ \text{ in } \Omega, \\ & y=0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ & u\in U_{ad}=\{v(x)|a\le v(x)\le b, \text{a.e. on } \Omega\}\subseteq U, \end{cases} \tag{P}$$

where $Y := H^1_0(\Omega)$, $U := L^2(\Omega)$, $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ is a convex, open and bounded domain with $C^{1,1}$- or polygonal boundary Γ; the source term $y_c \in L^2(\Omega)$ and the desired state $y_d \in L^2(\Omega)$; parameters

*School of Mathematical Sciences, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, Liaoning 116025, China (songxiaoliang@mail.dlut.edu.cn).

†Corresponding author. School of Mathematical Sciences, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, Liaoning 116024, China. (yubo@dlut.edu.cn).

$-\infty < a < b < +\infty$, $\alpha > 0$ and the operator L is a second-order linear elliptic differential operator. Such problem (P) is very important in practical applications, e.g., the electro-magnetic induction with distributed heat source.

Optimization problems with constraints which require the solution of a partial differential equation arise widely in many areas of the sciences and engineering, in particular in problems of design. Optimal control problems with control constraints and their numerical realization have been studied intensively in recent papers, see e.g., [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] and the references cited there. Let us first comment on known results on error estimates analysis of control constrained optimal control problems. Basic a-priori error estimates were derived by Falk [2] and Geveci [3] where Falk considered distributed controls, while Geveci concentrates on Neuman boundary controls. Both the authors for piecewise constant control approximations prove optimal L^2-error estimates $\mathcal{O}(h)$. Meanwhile, we refer to Arada and Raymond [6], where the authors contributed further errors estimate for piecewise constant control approximations and showed convergence of the same order $\mathcal{O}(h)$ in L^∞ norm. Furthermore, for the approximation of controls by piecewise linear, globally continuous elements, as far as we know, the first error estimates for this type of approximations were proved by Casas and Tröltzsch [4]in the case of linear-quadratic control problems, proving order $\mathcal{O}(h)$. Later Casas [7] proved order $o(h)$ for control problems governed by semilinear elliptic equations and quite general cost functionals. In [8], Rösch proved that the error order is $\mathcal{O}(h^{\frac{3}{2}})$ under special assumptions on the continuous solutions, compare also Casas and Tröltzsch [4]. However, his proof was done for linearquadratic control problems in one dimension. Moreover, a variational discretization concept is introduced by Hinze [1] and a control error of order $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ is obtained. In certain situations, the same convergence order also can be achieved by a special postprocessing procedure, see Meyer and Rösch [5].

Next, let us mention some existing numerical methods for solving problem (P). As far as we know, most of the aforementioned papers are devoted to directly solve the first-order optimality system, which result in a nonsmooth equation that has to be solved. For this purpose, applying semismooth Newton methods is used to be a priority. A special semismooth Newton method with the active set strategy, called the primal-dual active set (PDAS) method is introduced in [9] for control constrained elliptic optimal control problems. It is proved to have the locally superlinear convergence (see [10] for more details). Furthermore, mesh-independence results for semismooth Newton methods were established in [11]. However, in general, it is expensive in solving Newton equations, especially when the discretization is in a fine level.

Recently, for the finite dimensional large scale optimization problems, some efficient first-order algorithms, such as iterative shrinkage/soft thresholding algorithms (ISTA) [12], accelerated proximal gradient (APG)-based methods [13, 14, 15], the ADMM [16, 17, 18, 19], etc., have become the state of the art algorithms. In this paper, we will mainly focus on the ADMM. The classical ADMM was originally proposed by Glowinski and Marroco [20] and Gabay and Mercier [21], and it has found lots of efficient applications. In particular, we refer to [16] for a review of the applications of the ADMM in the areas of distributed optimization and statistical learning.

Motivated by above-mentioned facts, we aim to design an algorithm which could solve (P) to obtain high accurate solution efficiently and fast. To achieve our goal, combining the ADMM and semismooth Newton methods together, a two-phase algorithm is proposed in function space. Specifically, the classical ADMM is developed in Phase-I with the aim of solving an optimal control problem moderate accuracy or using it to generate a reasonably good initial point to warm-start Phase-II. In Phase-II, the PDAS method is used to obtain accurate solutions fast. More importantly, as will be mentioned in Section 2, each subproblem of the ADMM has a well-formed structure. Focusing on these inherent structures of the ADMM in function space is worthwhile for us to propose an appropriate discretization scheme and give a suitable algorithm to solve the corresponding discretized problem. Moreover, it will be a crucial point in the numerical analysis to establish similar structures parallel to the ADMM in function space for the discretized problem.

To discretize problem (P), we consider to use the piecewise linear finite element. Then, in Phase-I, in order to use ADMM-type algorithm to solve the corresponding discretization problem, an artificial

variable z should be introduced, and the discretization problem could be equivalently rewritten as a separable form. However, when the classical ADMM is directly used to solve discretized problems, there is no well-formed structure as in continuous case. An important fact is that discretization and algorithms should not be viewed as independent. Rather, they must be intertwined to yield an efficient algorithm for discretized problems. Hence, making use of the inherent structure of problem, an heterogeneous ADMM is proposed. Different from the classical ADMM, we utilize two different weighted inner products to define the augmented Lagrangian function for two subproblems, respectively. Specifically, based on the M_h-weighted inner product, the augmented Lagrangian function with respect to the u-subproblem in k-th iteration is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_\sigma(u, z^k; \lambda^k) = f(u) + g(z^k) + \langle \lambda, M_h(u - z^k)\rangle + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|u - z^k\|^2_{M_h},$$

where M_h is the mass matrix. On the other hand, for the z-subproblem, based on the W_h-weighted inner product, the augmented Lagrangian function in k-th iteration is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_\sigma(u^{k+1}, z; \lambda^k) = f(u^{k+1}) + g(z) + \langle \lambda, M_h(u^{k+1} - z)\rangle + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|u^{k+1} - z\|^2_{W_h},$$

where the lumped mass matrix W_h is diagonal. Furthermore, sometimes it is unnecessary to exactly compute the solution of each subproblem even if it is doable, especially at the early stage of the whole process. For example, if a subproblem is equivalent to solving a large-scale or ill-condition linear system, it is a natural idea to use the iterative methods such as some Krylov-based methods. Hence, taking the inexactness of the solutions of associated subproblems into account, a more practical inexact heterogeneous ADMM (ihADMM) is proposed.

As will be mentioned in the Section 4, benefiting from different weighted techniques, each subproblem of ihADMM for $(\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h)$, i.e., the discrete version of (P), can be efficiently solved. Specifically, the u-subproblem of ihADMM, which result in a large scale linear system, is the main computation cost in whole algorithm. M_h-weighted technique could help us to reduce the block three-by-three system to a block two-by-two system without any computational cost so as to reduce calculation amount. On the other hand, W_h-weighted technique makes z-subproblem have a decoupled form and admit a closed form solution given by the soft thresholding operator and the projection operator onto the box constraint $[a, b]$. Moreover, global convergence and the iteration complexity result $o(1/k)$ in non-ergodic sense for our ihADMM will be proved.

Taking the precision of discretized error into account, we should mention that using our ihADMM algorithm to solve problem $(\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h)$ is highly enough and efficient in obtaining an approximate solution with moderate accuracy. Nevertheless, in order to obtain more accurate solutions, if necessarily required, combining ihADMM and semismooth Newton methods together, we give a two-phase strategy. Specifically, our ihADMM algorithm as the Phase-I is used to generate a reasonably good initial point to warm-start Phase-II. In Phase-II, the PDAS method as a postprocessor of our ihADMM is employed to solve the discrete problem to high accuracy.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, a two-phase strategy with an inexact ADMM as Phase-I and PDAS as Phase-II in function space for solving (P) is described. In Section 3, the finite element approximation is introduced. In Section 4, an inexact heterogeneous ADMM is proposed. And as the Phase-II algorithm, the PDAS method is also presented. In Section 5, numerical results are given to show the efficiency of our ihADMM and two-phase strategy. Finally, we conclude our paper in Section 6.

Through this paper, let us suppose the elliptic PDEs involved in (P)

$$\begin{aligned} Ly &= u + y_c \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ y &= 0 \qquad\quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

satisfy the following assumption:

Assumption 1.1. *The linear second-order differential operator L is defined by*

$$(Ly)(x) := -\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \partial_{x_j}(a_{ij}(x)y_{x_i}) + c_0(x)y(x), \tag{1.2}$$

where functions $a_{ij}(x), c_0(x) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $c_0 \geq 0$, and it is uniformly elliptic, i.e. $a_{ij}(x) = a_{ji}(x)$ and there is a constant $\theta > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a_{ij}(x)\xi_i\xi_j \geq \theta\|\xi\|^2 \qquad \text{for a.a. } x \in \Omega \text{ and } \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{1.3}$$

The weak formulation of (1.1) is given by

$$\text{Find } y \in H_0^1(\Omega): \ a(y,v) = (u + y_c, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{for } \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega) \tag{1.4}$$

with the bilinear form

$$a(y,v) = \int_\Omega (\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a_{ji}y_{x_i}v_{x_i} + c_0yv)\mathrm{d}x. \tag{1.5}$$

Then, utilizing the Lax-Milgram lemma, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 1.2 ([22, Theorem B.4])**.** *Under Assumption* 1.1*, the bilinear form $a(\cdot,\cdot)$ in* (1.5) *is bounded and V-coercive for $V = H_0^1(\Omega)$ and the associate operator A has a bounded inverse. In particular, for a given $y_c \in L^2(\Omega)$ and every $u \in L^2(\Omega)$,* (1.1) *has a unique weak solution $y = y(u) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ given by* (1.4)*. Furthermore,*

$$\|y\|_{H^1} \leq C\|u + y_c\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{1.6}$$

for a constant C depending only on a_{ij}, c_0 and Ω.

By Proposition 1.2, the solution operator $\mathcal{S}$: $H^{-1}(\Omega) \to H_0^1(\Omega)$ with $y(u) := \mathcal{S}(u + y_c)$ is well-defined and called the control-to-state mapping, which is a continuous linear injective operator. Since $H_0^1(\Omega)$ is a Hilbert space, the adjoint operator $\mathcal{S}^*$: $H^{-1}(\Omega) \to H_0^1(\Omega)$ is also a continuous linear operator.

2 A two-phase method in function space

As we have mentioned, the ADMM is a simple but powerful algorithm that is well suited to distributed convex optimization, and in particular to large scale problems arising in applied machine learning and related areas. Motivated by the success of the finite dimensional ADMM algorithm, it is strongly desirable and practically valuable to extend the ADMM to optimal control problems. Moreover, if more accurate solution is necessarily required, combining ADMM and semismooth Newton methods together is a wise choice. Thus, in this section, we will introduce a two-phase strategy. Specifically, an inexact ADMM (iADMM) is developed in Phase-I with the aim of generating a reasonably good initial point to warm-start Phase-II. In Phase-II, the primal-dual active set (PDAS) method is used as a postprocessor of the iADMM.

2.1 An inexact ADMM in function space

In this section, we first introduce an inexact ADMM for problem (P) as the Phase-I algorithm. To obtain a separable form and separate the smooth and nonsmooth terms, by adding an artificial variable

z, we can equivalently reformulate problem (P) in as:

$$\begin{cases} \min\limits_{(y,u,z)\in Y\times U\times U} & \frac{1}{2}\|y-y_d\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}+\frac{\alpha}{2}\|u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}+\delta_{U_{ad}}(z) \\ \text{s.t.} & y=\mathcal{S}(u+y_c), \\ & u=z. \end{cases} \tag{DP}$$

It is clear that problem (P) is strongly convex. Therefore, By the equivalence between (P) and (DP), the existence and uniqueness of solution of (DP) is obvious. The optimal solution (y^*, u^*, z^*) can be characterized by the following Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions.

Theorem 2.1 (First-Order Optimality Condition)**.** *Under Assumption 1.1,* (y^*, u^*, z^*) *is the optimal solution of* (DP)*, if and only if there exists adjoint state* $p^* \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ *and Lagrange multiplier* $\lambda^* \in L^2(\Omega)$*, such that the following conditions hold in the weak sense*

$$\begin{cases} y^*=\mathcal{S}(u^*+y_c), \\ p^*=\mathcal{S}^*(y_d-y^*), \\ \alpha u^*-p^*+\lambda^*=0, \\ u^*=z^*, \\ z^*=\Pi_{U_{ad}}(z^*+\lambda^*). \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where the projection operator $\Pi_{U_{ad}}(\cdot)$ *is defined as follows:*

$$\Pi_{U_{ad}}(v(x)) := \max\{a, \min\{v(x), b\}\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Moreover, by Proposition 1.2, and using the operator $\mathcal{S}$, we equivalently rewrite problem (DP) as the following reduced form :

$$\begin{cases} \min\limits_{u,z} & \hat{J}(u)+\delta_{U_{ad}}(z) \\ \text{s.t.} & u=z, \end{cases} \tag{RDP}$$

with the reduced cost function

$$\hat{J}(u) := J(\mathcal{S}(u+y_c), u) = \frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{S}(u+y_c)-y_d\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}+\frac{\alpha}{2}\|u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{2.3}$$

Let us define the augmented Lagrangian function of the problem (RDP) as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_\sigma(u,z;\lambda) = \hat{J}(u)+\delta_{U_{ad}}(z)+\langle\lambda, u-z\rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}+\frac{\sigma}{2}\|u-z\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{2.4}$$

with the Lagrange multiplier $\lambda \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $\sigma > 0$ be a penalty parameter. Moreover, for the convergence property and the iteration complexity analysis, we define the function $R : (u, z, \lambda) \to [0, \infty)$ by:

$$R(u,z,\lambda) = \|\nabla\hat{J}(u)+\lambda\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}+\text{dist}^2(0, -\lambda+\partial\delta_{U_{ad}}(z))+\|u-z\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{2.5}$$

In addition, sometimes, it is expensive and unnecessary to exactly compute the solution of each subproblem even if it is doable, especially at the early stage of the whole process. For example, if a subproblem is equivalent to solving a large-scale or ill-condition linear system, it is a natural idea to use the iterative methods such as some Krylov-based methods. Hence, taking the inexactness of the solution into account, a more practical inexact ADMM (iADMM) in function space is proposed for (RDP). The iterative scheme of inexact ADMM is shown in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: inexact ADMM algorithm for (RDP)

Input: $(z^0, u^0, \lambda^0) \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta_{U_{ad}}(\cdot)) \times L^2(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$ and a parameter $\tau \in (0, \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2})$. Let $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ be a sequence satisfying $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty} \subseteq [0, +\infty)$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \epsilon_k < \infty$. Set $k = 0$

Output: u^k, z^k, λ^k

Step 1 Find an minizer (inexact)

$$u^{k+1} = \arg\min \mathcal{L}_\sigma(u, z^k; \lambda^k) - \langle \delta^k, u \rangle$$

where the error vector δ^k satisfies $\|\delta^k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \epsilon_k$

Step 2 Compute z^{k+1} as follows:

$$z^{k+1} = \arg\min \mathcal{L}_\sigma(u^{k+1}, z; \lambda^k)$$

Step 3 Compute

$$\lambda^{k+1} = \lambda^k + \tau\sigma(u^{k+1} - z^{k+1})$$

Step 4 If a termination criterion is not met, set $k := k + 1$ and go to Step 1

About the global convergence as well as the iteration complexity of the inexact ADMM for (DP), we have the following results.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that Assumption1.1 holds. Let $(y^*, u^*, z^*, p^*, \lambda^*)$ is the KKT point of* (DP) *which satisfies* (2.1)*, then the sequence $\{(u^k, z^k, \lambda^k)\}$ is generated by Algorithm 1 with the associated state $\{y^k\}$ and adjoint state $\{p^k\}$, then we have*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \{\|u^k - u^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z^k - z^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\} = 0$$
$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \{\|y^k - y^*\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} + \|p^k - p^*\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}\} = 0$$

Moreover, there exists a constant C only depending on the initial point (u^0, z^0, λ^0) and the optimal solution (u^*, z^*, λ^*) such that for $k \geq 1$,

$$\min_{1\leq i\leq k} \{R(u^i, z^i, \lambda^i)\} \leq \frac{C}{k}, \tag{2.6}$$

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \left(k \times \min_{1\leq i\leq k} \{R(u^i, z^i, \lambda^i)\} \right) = 0. \tag{2.7}$$

where $R(\cdot)$ is defined as in (2.5)

Proof. The proof is a direct application of general inexact ADMM in Hilbert Space for the problem (RDP) and omitted here. We refer the reader to the literature [17, 23] □

Remark 2.3. *1). The first subproblems of Algorithm* 1 *is a convex differentiable optimization problem with respect to u, if we omit the error vector δ^k, thus it is equivalent to solving the following system:*

$$\nabla_u \mathcal{L}_\sigma(u^{k+1}, z^k; \lambda^k) := \mathcal{S}^*(\mathcal{S}(u^{k+1} + y_c) - y_d) + \alpha u^{k+1} + \lambda^k + \sigma(u^{k+1} - z^k) = 0 \tag{2.8}$$

Since $y^{k+1} = \mathcal{S}(u^{k+1} + y_c)$, we define $p^{k+1} := -\mathcal{S}^*(\mathcal{S}(u^{k+1} + y_c) - y_d) = \mathcal{S}^*(y_d - y)$, then we have

$$(\alpha + \sigma)u^{k+1} - p^{k+1} + \lambda^k - \sigma z^k = 0, \tag{2.9}$$

namely, we should solve

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & \mathcal{S}^{-*} \\ 0 & (\alpha+\sigma)I & -I \\ \mathcal{S}^{-1} & -I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y^{k+1} \\ u^{k+1} \\ p^{k+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} y_d \\ \sigma z^k - \lambda^k \\ y_c \end{bmatrix}, \tag{2.10}$$

Moreover, we could eliminate the variable p and derive the following reduced system:

$$\begin{bmatrix} (\alpha+\sigma)I & \mathcal{S}^* \\ -\mathcal{S} & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u^{k+1} \\ y^{k+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{S}^* y_d + \sigma z^k - \lambda^k \\ \mathcal{S} y_c, \end{bmatrix} \tag{2.11}$$

where I represents the identity operator. Clearly, linear system (2.11) *can be formally regarded as a special case of the generalized saddle-point problem, however, in the numerical calculation, it is either impossible or extremely expensive to obtain exact solutions of* (2.11)*. This fact urges us to use an inexact versions of ADMM. This is also the reason that there is a error vector* δ^k *in the first subproblem of our algorithm. As we know, according to the structure of the linear system* (2.11)*, some* Krylov-*based methods could be employed to inexactly solve the linear system by constructing a good preconditioning.*

2). It is easy to see that z-subproblem has a closed solution:

$$z^{k+1} = \Pi_{U_{ad}}(u^{k+1} + \frac{\lambda^k}{\sigma}), \tag{2.12}$$

Based on the well-formed structure of (2.11) and (2.12), it will be a crucial point in the numerical analysis to establish relations parallel to (2.11) and (2.12) also for the discretized problem.

2.2 Semismooth Newton methods in function space

At the end of this section, let us introduce the primal and dual active set (PDAS) method as our Phase-II algorithm. As we know, with the solution of the Phase-I as a good initial point, the PDAS method could employ the second-order information to solve the discrete problem to high accuracy. For problem (P), the unique optimal solution (y^*, u^*) could be characterized by the following necessary and sufficient first-order optimality conditions.

$$G(y^*, u^*, p^*, \mu) = \begin{pmatrix} y^* - \mathcal{S}(u^* + y_c) \\ p^* + \mathcal{S}^*(y^* - y_d) \\ \alpha u^* - p^* + \mu^* \\ \mu^* - \max(0, \mu^* + c(u^* - b)) - \min(0, \mu^* + c(u^* - a)) \end{pmatrix} = 0 \tag{2.13}$$

for any $c > 0$.

Since equation (2.13) is not differentiable in the classical sense, thus a so-called semi-smooth Newton method can be applied and it is well posed. And an semismooth Newton with active set strategy can be implemented. The full numerical scheme is summarized in Algorithm 1:

Algorithm 2: Primal-Dual Active Set (PDAS) method for (P)

Initialization: Choose y^0, u^0, p^0 and μ^0. Set $k = 0$ and $c > 0$.

Step 1 Determine the following subsets of Ω (Active and Inactive sets)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_a^{k+1} &= \{x \in \Omega : \mu^k(x) + c(u^k(x) - a) < 0\},\\ \mathcal{A}_b^{k+1} &= \{x \in \Omega : \mu^k(x) + c(u^k(x) - b) > 0\},\\ \mathcal{I}^{k+1} &= \Omega\backslash(\mathcal{A}_a^{k+1} \cup \mathcal{A}_a^{k+1}).\end{aligned}$$

Step 2 solve the following system

$$\begin{cases} y^{k+1} - \mathcal{S}(u^{k+1} + y_c) = 0,\\ p^{k+1} + \mathcal{S}^*(y^{k+1} - y_d) = 0,\\ \alpha u^{k+1} - p^{k+1} + \mu^{k+1} = 0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$u^{k+1} = \begin{cases} a & \text{a.e. on } \mathcal{A}_a^{k+1}\\ b & \text{a.e. on } \mathcal{A}_b^{k+1}\end{cases} \qquad \textit{and} \quad \mu^{k+1} = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{I}^{k+1}$$

Step 3 If a termination criterion is not met, set $k := k + 1$ and go to Step 1

The primal-dual active set strategy has been introduced in [9] for control constrained elliptic optimal control problems. Its relation to semismooth Newton methods in $\mathbb{R}^n$ as well as in function space as found in [24] can be used to prove the following fast local convergence (see [10, 25] for more details).

Theorem 2.4. *Under Assumption* 1.1*, let* $\{(y^k, u^k)\}$ *be generated by Algorithm 2. Then, if the initialization* (y^0, u^0) *is sufficiently close to the solution* (y^*, u^*) *of* P*, the* $\{(y^k, u^k)\}$ *converge superlinearly to* (y^*, u^*) *in* $L^2(\Omega) \times H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Due to the efficient implementation of the two-phase framework with Algorithm 1 in Phase-I and Algorithm 2 in Phase-II, it will be important to establish the extension of two-phase algorithm for the discretized problem.

3 Finite Element Approximation

To numerically solve problem (P), we consider the finite element method, in which the state y and the control u are both discretized by continuous piecewise linear functions.

To this aim, we first consider a family of regular and quasi-uniform triangulations $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_{h>0}$ of $\bar{\Omega}$. For each cell $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, let us define the diameter of the set T by $\rho_T := \text{diam } T$ and define σ_T to be the diameter of the largest ball contained in T. The mesh size of the grid is defined by $h = \max_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \rho_T$. We suppose that the following regularity assumptions on the triangulation are satisfied which are standard in the context of error estimates.

Assumption 3.1 (Regular and quasi-uniform triangulations)**.** *There exist two positive constants* κ *and* τ *such that*

$$\frac{\rho_T}{\sigma_T} \le \kappa, \quad \frac{h}{\rho_T} \le \tau,$$

hold for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ *and all* $h > 0$*. Moreover, let us define* $\bar{\Omega}_h = \bigcup_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} T$*, and let* $\Omega_h \subset \Omega$ *and* Γ_h *denote its interior and its boundary, respectively. In the case that* Ω *is a convex polyhedral domain, we have* $\Omega = \Omega_h$*. In case* Ω *with a* $C^{1,1}$*- boundary* Γ*, we assumed that* $\bar{\Omega}_h$ *is convex and that all boundary*

vertices of $\bar{\Omega}_h$ *are contained in* Γ*, such that*

$$|\Omega \backslash \Omega_h| \leq ch^2,$$

where $|\cdot|$ *denotes the measure of the set and* $c > 0$ *is a constant.*

On account of the homogeneous boundary condition of the state equation, we use

$$Y_h \quad = \quad \left\{ y_h \in C(\bar{\Omega}) \;\middle|\; y_{h|T} \in \mathcal{P}_1 \text{ for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h \text{ and } y_h = 0 \text{ in } \bar{\Omega} \backslash \Omega_h \right\}$$

as the discrete state space, where $\mathcal{P}_1$ denotes the space of polynomials of degree less than or equal to 1. Next, we also consider use the same discrete space to discretize control u, thus we define

$$U_h = \left\{ u_h \in C(\bar{\Omega}) \;\middle|\; u_{h|T} \in \mathcal{P}_1 \text{ for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h \text{ and } u_h = 0 \text{ in } \bar{\Omega} \backslash \Omega_h \right\}.$$

For a given regular and quasi-uniform triangulation $\mathcal{T}_h$ with nodes $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{N_h}$, let $\{\phi_i(x)\}_{i=1}^{N_h}$ be a set of nodal basis functions associated with nodes $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{N_h}$, which span Y_h as well as U_h and satisfy the following properties:

$$\phi_i(x) \geq 0, \quad \|\phi_i(x)\|_\infty = 1 \quad \forall i = 1, 2, ..., N_h, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N_h} \phi_i(x) = 1. \tag{3.1}$$

The elements $u_h \in U_h$ and $y_h \in Y_h$ can be represented in the following forms, respectively,

$$u_h = \sum_{i=1}^{N_h} u_i \phi_i(x), \quad y_h = \sum_{i=1}^{N_h} y_i \phi_i(x),$$

and $u_h(x_i) = u_i$ and $y_h(x_i) = y_i$ hold. Let $U_{ad,h}$ denotes the discrete feasible set, which is defined by

$$U_{ad,h} := U_h \cap U_{ad} = \left\{ z_h = \sum_{i=1}^{N_h} z_i \phi_i(x) \;\middle|\; a \leq z_i \leq b, \forall i = 1, ..., m \right\} \subset U_{ad}.$$

Now, we can consider a discrete version of the problem (P) as:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_{(y_h, u_h) \in Y_h \times U_h} & J_h(y_h, u_h) = \dfrac{1}{2} \|y_h - y_d\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_h)} + \dfrac{\alpha}{2} \|u_h\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_h)} \\ \text{s.t.} & a(y_h, v_h) = \displaystyle\int_\Omega u_h v_h \mathrm{d}x \qquad \forall v_h \in Y_h, \\ & u_h \in U_{ad,h}. \end{array} \right. \tag{P_h}$$

Followed the error estimates result in [7], we have the following results.

Theorem 3.2. *Let us assume that* u^* *and* u_h^* *be the optimal control solutions of* (P) *and* (P_h)*, respectively. Then the following identity holds*

$$\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{1}{h} \|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0.$$

Moreover, let

$$K_h = (a(\phi_i, \phi_j))_{i,j=1}^n, \quad M_h = \left(\int_{\Omega_h} \phi_i \phi_j \mathrm{d}x \right)_{i,j=1}^n$$

be the finite element stiffness and mass matrixes, respectively.

Moreover, as a result of the requirement of following algorithms, we introduce the lump mass matrix

W_h which is a diagonal matrix as:

$$W_h = \mathrm{diag}\left(\int_{\Omega_h} \phi_i(x)\mathrm{dx}\right)_{i,j=1}^{n}.$$

It should be mentioned that the lump mass matrix W_h originates in the following nodal quadrature formulas to approximately discretized the L^2-norm:

$$\|z_h\|^2_{L^2_h(\Omega_h)} := \sum_{i=1}^{N_h}(z_i)^2 \int_{\Omega_h} \phi_i(x)\mathrm{dx} = \|z\|^2_{W_h}.$$

and call them L^2_h-norm. It is obvious that the L^2_h-norm can be considered as a weighted l^2-norm of the coefficient of z_h. More importantly, we have the following results about the mass matrix M_h and the lump mass matrix W_h.

Proposition 3.3. [26, Table 1] $\forall\ z \in \mathbb{R}^{N_h}$, *the following inequalities hold:*

$$\|z\|^2_{M_h} \le \|z_h\|^2_{W_h} \le c\|z_h\|^2_{M_h}, \quad where \quad c = \begin{cases} 4 & if \quad n = 2, \\ 5 & if \quad n = 3. \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

Denoting by $y_{c,h} := \sum\limits_{i=1}^{N_h} y_c^i \phi_i(x)$ and $y_{d,h} := \sum\limits_{i=1}^{N_h} y_d^i \phi_i(x)$ the L^2-projection of y_c and y_d onto Y_h, respectively, where $y_d^i = y_d(x^i)$, and identifying discrete functions with their coefficient vectors, we can rewrite the problem (P_h) as a matrix-vector form:

$$\begin{cases} \min\limits_{(y,u,z)\in\mathbb{R}^{3N_h}} & \dfrac{1}{2}\|y - y_d\|^2_{M_h} + \dfrac{\alpha}{2}\|u\|^2_{M_h} \\ \text{s.t.} & K_h y = M_h(u + y_c), \\ & u \in [a,b]^{N_h}. \end{cases} \tag{$\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h$}$$

4 An inexact heterogeneous ADMM algorithm and two-phase strategy for discretized problems

In this section, we will introduce an inexact ADMM algorithm and a two-phase strategy for discrete problems. Firstly, in order to establish relations parallel to (2.11) and (2.12) for the discrete problem $(\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h)$, we propose an inexact heterogeneous ADMM (ihADMM) algorithm with the aim of solving $(\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h)$ to moderate accuracy. Furthermore, as we have mentioned, if more accurate solutions is necessarily required, combining our ihADMM and the PDAS method is a wise choice. Then a two-phase strategy is introduced. Specifically, utilizing the solution generated by our ihADMM, as a reasonably good initial point, PDAS is used as a postprocessor of our ihADMM. Similar to continuous case, in order to get a separable form for problem $(\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h)$, we introduce an artificial variable z and equivalently rewrite the problem $(\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h)$ as:

$$\begin{cases} \min\limits_{y,u,z} & \dfrac{1}{2}\|y - y_d\|^2_{M_h} + \dfrac{\alpha}{2}\|u\|^2_{M_h} + \delta_{[a,b]}(z) \\ \text{s.t.} & K_h y = M_h u, \\ & u = z. \end{cases} \tag{$\overline{\mathrm{DP}}_h$}$$

Since the stiffness matrix K_h and the mass matrix M_h are symmetric positive definite matrices, then problem $(\overline{\mathrm{DP}}_h)$ can be rewritten the following reduced form:

$$\begin{cases} \min\limits_{u,z} & f(u)+g(z) \\ \text{s.t.} & u=z. \end{cases} \tag{$\overline{\mathrm{RDP}}_h$}$$

with the reduced cost functions

$$f(u) := \frac{1}{2}\|K_h^{-1}M_h(u+y_c)-y_d\|_{M_h}^2+\frac{\alpha}{2}\|u\|_{M_h}^2, \tag{4.1}$$

$$g(z) := \delta_{[a,b]^{N_h}}. \tag{4.2}$$

To solve $(\overline{\mathrm{RDP}}_h)$ by using ADMM-type algorithm, we first introduce the augmented Lagrangian function for $(\overline{\mathrm{RDP}}_h)$. According to three possible choices of norms ($\mathbb{R}^{N_h}$ norm, W_h-weighted norm and M_h-weighted norm), for the augmented Lagrangian function, there are three versions as follows: for given $\sigma>0$,

$$\mathcal{L}_\sigma^1(u,z;\lambda) := f(u)+g(z)+\langle\lambda,u-z\rangle+\frac{\sigma}{2}\|u-z\|^2, \tag{4.3}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_\sigma^2(u,z;\lambda) := f(u)+g(z)+\langle\lambda,M_h(u-z)\rangle+\frac{\sigma}{2}\|u-z\|_{W_h}^2, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_\sigma^3(u,z;\lambda) := f(u)+g(z)+\langle\lambda,M_h(u-z)\rangle+\frac{\sigma}{2}\|u-z\|_{M_h}^2. \tag{4.5}$$

Then based on these three versions of augmented Lagrangian function, we give the following four versions of ADMM-type algorithm for $(\overline{\mathrm{RDP}}_h)$ at k-th ineration: for given $\tau>0$ and $\sigma>0$,

$$\begin{cases} u^{k+1}=\arg\min\limits_u\ f(u)+\langle\lambda^k,u-z^k\rangle+\sigma/2\|u-z^k\|^2, \\ z^{k+1}=\arg\min\limits_z\ g(z)+\langle\lambda^k,u^{k+1}-z\rangle+\sigma/2\|u^{k+1}-z\|^2, \\ \lambda^{k+1}=\lambda^k+\tau\sigma(u^{k+1}-z^{k+1}). \end{cases} \tag{ADMM1}$$

$$\begin{cases} u^{k+1}=\arg\min\limits_u\ f(u)+\langle\lambda^k,W_h(u-z^k)\rangle+\sigma/2\|u-z^k\|_{W_h}^2, \\ z^{k+1}=\arg\min\limits_z\ g(z)+\langle\lambda^k,W_h(u^{k+1}-z)\rangle+\sigma/2\|u^{k+1}-z\|_{W_h}^2, \\ \lambda^{k+1}=\lambda^k+\tau\sigma(u^{k+1}-z^{k+1}). \end{cases} \tag{ADMM2}$$

$$\begin{cases} u^{k+1}=\arg\min\limits_u\ f(u)+\langle\lambda^k,M_h(u-z^k)\rangle+\sigma/2\|u-z^k\|_{M_h}^2, \\ z^{k+1}=\arg\min\limits_z\ g(z)+\langle\lambda^k,M_h(u^{k+1}-z)\rangle+\sigma/2\|u^{k+1}-z\|_{M_h}^2, \\ \lambda^{k+1}=\lambda^k+\tau\sigma(u^{k+1}-z^{k+1}). \end{cases} \tag{ADMM3}$$

$$\begin{cases} u^{k+1}=\arg\min\limits_u\ f(u)+\langle\lambda^k,M_h(u-z^k)\rangle+\sigma/2\|u-z^k\|_{M_h}^2, \\ z^{k+1}=\arg\min\limits_z\ g(z)+\langle\lambda^k,M_h(u^{k+1}-z)\rangle+\sigma/2\|u^{k+1}-z\|_{W_h}^2, \\ \lambda^{k+1}=\lambda^k+\tau\sigma(u^{k+1}-z^{k+1}). \end{cases} \tag{ADMM4}$$

As one may know, (ADMM1) is actually the classical ADMM for $(\overline{\mathrm{RDP}}_h)$, meanwhile, (ADMM2), (ADMM3) and (ADMM4) can be regarded as three different discretized forms of Algorithm 1.

Now, let us start to analyze and compare the advantages and disadvantages of the four algorithms. Firstly, we focus on the z-subproblem in each algorithm. Since both identity matrix I and lumped mass matrix W_h are diagonal, it is clear that all the z-subproblems in (ADMM1), (ADMM2) and (ADMM4) have a closed form solution, except for the z-subproblem in (ADMM3). Specifically, for

z-subproblem in (ADMM1), the closed form solution could be given by:

$$z^k = \Pi_{U_{ad}}\left(u^{k+1} + \frac{\lambda^k}{\sigma}\right). \tag{4.6}$$

Similarly, for z-subproblems in (ADMM2) and (ADMM4), the closed form solution could be given by:

$$z^{k+1} = \Pi_{U_{ad}}\left(u^{k+1} + \frac{W_h^{-1}M_h\lambda^k}{\sigma}\right) \tag{4.7}$$

Fortunately, the expressions of (4.6) and (4.7) are similar to (2.12). As we have mentioned that, from the view of both the actual numerical implementation and convergence analysis of the algorithm, establishing such parallel relation is important.

In addition, to ensure the z-subproblem in (ADMM3) have a closed form solution, we could add a proximal term $\frac{\sigma}{2}\|z - z^k\|^2_{\theta I - M_h}$ to z-subproblem, thus we get

$$\begin{aligned} z^{k+1} =& \arg\min_z \ \mathcal{L}^3_\sigma(u^{k+1}, z; \lambda^k) + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|z - z^k\|^2_{\theta I - M_h} \\ =& \Pi_{U_{ad}}\left(\frac{1}{\sigma\theta}M_h(\sigma u^{k+1} + \lambda^k - \sigma z^k) + z^k\right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

In this case, we call this method the linearized ADMM (LADMM), one can refer to [27]. It is well known that the efficiency of the LADMM depends on how close is the chosen θ to the minimal and optimal value $\|M_h\|_2$. However, this quantity is not always easily computable.

Next, let us analyze the structure of u-subproblem in each algorithm. For (ADMM1), the first subproblem at k-th iteration is equivalent to solving the following linear system:

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_h & 0 & K_h \\ 0 & \alpha M_h + \sigma I & -M_h \\ K_h & -M_h & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y^{k+1} \\ u^{k+1} \\ p^{k+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M_h y_d \\ \sigma z^k - \lambda^k \\ M_h y_c \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.9}$$

Similarly, the u-subproblem in (ADMM2) can be converted into the following linear system:

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_h & 0 & K_h \\ 0 & \alpha M_h + \sigma W_h & -M_h \\ K_h & -M_h & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y^{k+1} \\ u^{k+1} \\ p^{k+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M_h y_d \\ \sigma W_h(z^k - \lambda^k) \\ M_h y_c \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.10}$$

However, the u-subproblem in both (ADMM3) and (ADMM4) can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_h & 0 & K_h \\ 0 & (\alpha + \sigma)M_h & -M_h \\ K_h & -M_h & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y^{k+1} \\ u^{k+1} \\ p^{k+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M_h y_d \\ M_h(\sigma z^k - \lambda^k) \\ M_h y_c \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.11}$$

In (4.11), since $p^{k+1} = (\alpha + \sigma)u^{k+1} - \sigma z^k + \lambda^k$, it is obvious that (4.11) can be reduced into the following system by eliminating the variable p without any computational cost:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\alpha+\sigma}M_h & K_h \\ -K_h & M_h \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y^{k+1} \\ u^{k+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\alpha+\sigma}(K_h(\sigma z^k - \lambda^k) + M_h y_d) \\ -M_h y_c \end{bmatrix}, \tag{4.12}$$

while, reduced forms of (4.9) and (4.10):

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_h & \frac{\alpha}{2}K_h + \sigma K_h M_h^{-1} \\ -K_h & M_h \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y^{k+1} \\ u^{k+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (K_h M_h^{-1}(\sigma z^k - \lambda^k) + M_h y_d) \\ -M_h y_c \end{bmatrix}, \tag{4.13}$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_h & \frac{\alpha}{2}K_h + \sigma K_h M_h^{-1} W_h \\ -K_h & M_h \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y^{k+1} \\ u^{k+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (K_h M_h^{-1} W_h(\sigma z^k - \lambda^k) + M_h y_d) \\ -M_h y_c \end{bmatrix}, \tag{4.14}$$

both involve the inversion of M_h. For above mentioned reasons, we prefer to use (ADMM4), which is called the heterogeneous ADMM (hADMM). However, in general, it is expensive and unnecessary to exactly compute the solution of saddle point system (4.12) even if it is doable, especially at the early stage of the whole process. Based on the structure of (4.12), it is a natural idea to use the iterative methods such as some Krylov-based methods. Hence, taking the inexactness of the solution of u-subproblem into account, a more practical inexact heterogeneous ADMM (ihADMM) algorithm is proposed.

Due to the inexactness of the proposed algorithm, we first introduce an error tolerance. Throughout this paper, let $\{\epsilon_k\}$ be a summable sequence of nonnegative numbers, and define

$$C_1 := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \epsilon_k \leq \infty, \quad C_2 := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \epsilon_k^2 \leq \infty. \tag{4.15}$$

The details of our ihADMM algorithm is shown in Algorithm 3 to solve $(\overline{\mathrm{RDP}}_h)$.

Algorithm 3: inexact heterogeneous ADMM algorithm for $(\overline{\mathrm{RDP}}_h)$

Input: $(z^0, u^0, \lambda^0) \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta_{[a,b]}(\cdot)) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and parameters $\sigma > 0$, $\tau > 0$. Set $k = 1$.
Output: u^k, z^k, λ^k

Step 1 Find an minizer (inexact)

$$u^{k+1} \quad = \quad \arg\min f(u) + (M_h\lambda^k, u - z^k) + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|u - z^k\|_{M_h}^2 - \langle \delta^k, u\rangle,$$

where the error vector δ^k satisfies $\|\delta^k\|_2 \leq \epsilon_k$

Step 2 Compute z^k as follows:

$$z^{k+1} \quad = \quad \arg\min g(z) + (M_h\lambda^k, u^{k+1} - z) + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|u^{k+1} - z\|_{W_h}^2$$

Step 3 Compute

$$\lambda^{k+1} \quad = \quad \lambda^k + \tau\sigma(u^{k+1} - z^{k+1}).$$

Step 4 If a termination criterion is not met, set $k := k + 1$ and go to Step 1

4.1 Convergence results of ihADMM

For the ihADMM, in this section we establish the global convergence and the iteration complexity results in non-ergodic sense for the sequence generated by Algorithm 3.

Before giving the proof of Theorem 4.5, we first provide a lemma, which is useful for analyzing the non-ergodic iteration complexity of ihADMM and introduced in [17].

Lemma 4.1. *If a sequence $\{a_i\} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the following conditions:*

$$a_i \geq 0 \text{ for any } i \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i = \bar{a} < \infty.$$

Then we have

$$\min_{i=1,\ldots,k}\{a_i\} \le \frac{\bar{a}}{k}, \quad \lim_{k\to\infty}\{k \cdot \min_{i=1,\ldots,k}\{a_i\}\} = 0.$$

For the convenience of the iteration complexity analysis in below, we define the function $R_h : (u, z, \lambda) \to [0, \infty)$ by:

$$R_h(u, z, \lambda) = \|M_h\lambda + \nabla f(u)\|^2 + \mathrm{dist}^2(0, -M_h\lambda + \partial g(z)) + \|u - z\|^2. \tag{4.16}$$

By the definitions of $f(u)$ and $g(z)$ in (4.1) and (4.2), it is obvious that $f(u)$ and $g(z)$ both are closed, proper and convex functions. Since M_h and K_h are symmetric positive definite matrixes, we know the gradient operator ∇f is strongly monotone, and we have

$$\langle \nabla f(u_1) - \nabla f(u_2), u_1 - u_2\rangle = \|u_1 - u_2\|^2_{\Sigma_f} \tag{4.17}$$

where $\Sigma_f = \alpha M_h + M_h K_h^{-1} M_h K_h^{-1} M_h$ is also a symmetric positive definite matrix. Moreover, the subdifferential operator ∂g is a maximal monotone operators, e.g.,

$$\langle \varphi_1 - \varphi_2, z_1 - z_2\rangle \ge 0, \quad \forall\ \varphi_1 \in \partial g(z_1),\ \varphi_2 \in \partial g(z_2). \tag{4.18}$$

For the subsequent convergence analysis, we denote

$$\bar{u}^{k+1} = \arg\min \hat{J}_h(u) + \langle M_h\lambda^k, u - z^k\rangle + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|u - z^k\|^2_{M_h} \tag{4.19}$$

$$\bar{z}^{k+1} = \Pi_{[a,b]}(\bar{u}^{k+1} + \frac{W_h^{-1}M_h\lambda^k}{\sigma}) \tag{4.20}$$

which is the exact solutions at the $(k+1)$th iteration in Algorithm 3. The following result shows the gap between (u^{k+1}, z^{k+1}) and $(\bar{u}^{k+1}, \bar{z}^{k+1})$ in terms of the given error tolerance $\|\delta^k\|_2 \le \epsilon_k$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\{(u^{k+1}, z^{k+1})\}$ be the squence generated by Algorithm 3, and $\{\bar{u}^{k+1}\}$, $\{\bar{z}^{k+1}\}$ be defined by (4.19) and (4.20). Then for any $k \ge 0$, we have*

$$\|u^{k+1} - \bar{u}^{k+1}\| = \|(\sigma M_h + \Sigma_f)^{-1}\delta^k\| \le \rho\epsilon_k, \tag{4.21}$$

$$\|z^{k+1} - \bar{z}^{k+1}\| \le \|u^{k+1} - \bar{u}^{k+1}\| \le \rho\epsilon_k, \tag{4.22}$$

where $\rho := \|(\sigma M_h + \Sigma_f)^{-1}\|$.

Proof. By the optimality conditions at point (u^{k+1}, z^{k+1}) and $(\bar{u}^{k+1}, \bar{z}^{k+1})$, we have

$$\Sigma_f u^{k+1} - M_h K_h^{-1} M_h y_d + M_h\lambda^k + \sigma M_h(u^{k+1} - z^k) - \delta^k = 0,$$
$$\Sigma_f \bar{u}^{k+1} - M_h K_h^{-1} M_h y_d + M_h\lambda^k + \sigma M_h(\bar{u}^{k+1} - z^k) = 0,$$

thus

$$u^{k+1} - \bar{u}^{k+1} = (\sigma M_h + \Sigma_f)^{-1}\delta^k$$

which implies (4.21). From (4.7) and (4.20), and the fact that the projection operator $\Pi_{[a,b]}(\cdot)$ is nonexpansive, we get

$$\|z^{k+1} - \bar{z}^{k+1}\| = \|\Pi_{[a,b]}(u^{k+1} + \frac{W_h^{-1}M_h\lambda^k}{\sigma}) - \Pi_{[a,b]}(\bar{u}^{k+1} + \frac{W_h^{-1}M_h\lambda^k}{\sigma})\| \le \|u^{k+1} - \bar{u}^{k+1}\|.$$

The proof is completed. □

Next, for $k \geq 0$, we define

$$r^k = u^k - z^k, \quad \bar{r}^k = \bar{u}^k - \bar{z}^k$$
$$\tilde{\lambda}^{k+1} = \lambda^k + \sigma r^{k+1}, \quad \bar{\lambda}^{k+1} = \lambda^k + \tau\sigma\bar{r}^{k+1}, \quad \hat{\lambda}^{k+1} = \lambda^k + \sigma\bar{r}^{k+1},$$

and give two inequalities which is essential for establishing both the global convergence and the iteration complexity of our ihADMM. For the details of the proof, one can see in Appendix.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\{(u^k, z^k, \lambda^k)\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 3 and (u^*, z^*, λ^*) be the KKT point of problem $(\overline{\mathrm{RDP}}_h)$. Then for $k \geq 0$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle \delta^k, u^{k+1} - u^* \rangle + \frac{1}{2\tau\sigma}\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2_{M_h} + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|z^k - z^*\|^2_{M_h} - \frac{1}{2\tau\sigma}\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2_{M_h} - \frac{\sigma}{2}\|z^{k+1} - z^*\|^2_{M_h} \\ &\geq \|u^{k+1} - u^*\|^2_T + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|z^{k+1} - z^*\|^2_{W_h - M_h} + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|r^{k+1}\|^2_{W_h - \tau M_h} + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|u^{k+1} - z^k\|^2_{M_h},\end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

where $T := \Sigma_f - \frac{\sigma}{2}(W_h - M_h)$.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\{(u^k, z^k, \lambda^k)\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 3, (u^*, z^*, λ^*) be the KKT point of the problem $(\overline{\mathrm{RDP}}_h)$ and $\{\bar{u}^k\}$ and $\{\bar{z}^k\}$ be two sequences defined in (4.19) and (4.20), respectively. Then for $k \geq 0$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2\tau\sigma}\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|^2_{M_h} + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|z^k - z^*\|^2_{M_h} - \frac{1}{2\tau\sigma}\|\bar{\lambda}^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|^2_{M_h} - \frac{\sigma}{2}\|\bar{z}^{k+1} - z^*\|^2_{M_h} \\ &\geq \|\bar{u}^{k+1} - u^*\|^2_T + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|\bar{z}^{k+1} - z^*\|^2_{W_h - M_h} + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|\bar{r}^{k+1}\|^2_{W_h - \tau M_h} + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|\bar{u}^{k+1} - z^k\|^2_{M_h},\end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

where $T := \Sigma_f - \frac{\sigma}{2}(W_h - M_h)$.

Then based on former results, we have the following convergence results.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $(y^*, u^*, z^*, p^*, \lambda^*)$ is the KKT point of $(\overline{\mathrm{DP}}_h)$, then the sequence $\{(u^k, z^k, \lambda^k)\}$ is generated by Algorithm 3 with the associated state $\{y^k\}$ and adjoint state $\{p^k\}$, then for any $\tau \in (0, 1]$ and $\sigma \in (0, \frac{1}{4}\alpha]$, we have*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\{\|u^k - u^*\| + \|z^k - z^*\| + \|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|\} = 0 \tag{4.25}$$
$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\{\|y^k - y^*\| + \|p^k - p^*\|\} = 0 \tag{4.26}$$

Moreover, there exists a constant C only depending on the initial point (u^0, z^0, λ^0) and the optimal solution (u^*, z^*, λ^*) such that for $k \geq 1$,

$$\min_{1\leq i\leq k}\{R_h(u^i, z^i, \lambda^i)\} \leq \frac{C}{k}, \quad \lim_{k\to\infty}\left(k \times \min_{1\leq i\leq k}\{R_h(u^i, z^i, \lambda^i)\}\right) = 0. \tag{4.27}$$

where $R_h(\cdot)$ is defined as in (4.16).

Proof. It is easy to see that (u^*, z^*) is the unique optimal solution of discrete problem $(\overline{\mathrm{RDP}}_h)$ if and only if there exists a Lagrangian multiplier λ^* such that the following Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions hold,

$$-M_h\lambda^* = \nabla f(u^*), \tag{4.28a}$$
$$M_h\lambda^* \in \partial g(z^*), \tag{4.28b}$$
$$u^* = z^*. \tag{4.28c}$$

In the inexact heterogeneous ADMM iteration scheme, the optimality conditions for (u^{k+1}, z^{k+1})

are

$$\delta^k - (M_h\lambda^k + \sigma M_h(u^{k+1} - z^k)) = \nabla f(u^{k+1}), \tag{4.29a}$$
$$M_h\lambda^k + \sigma W_h(u^{k+1} - z^{k+1}) \in \partial g(z^{k+1}). \tag{4.29b}$$

Next, let us first prove the **global convergence of iteration sequences,** e.g., establish the proof of (4.25) and (4.26). The first step is to show that $\{(u^k, z^k, \lambda^k)\}$ is bounded. We define the following sequence θ^k and $\bar{\theta}^k$ with:

$$\theta^k = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\tau\sigma}} M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}(\lambda^k - \lambda^*), \sqrt{\frac{\sigma}{2}} M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}(z^k - z^*)\right), \tag{4.30}$$
$$\bar{\theta}^k = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\tau\sigma}} M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{\lambda}^k - \lambda^*), \sqrt{\frac{\sigma}{2}} M_h^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{z}^k - z^*)\right). \tag{4.31}$$

According to Proposition 3.3, for any $\tau \in (0, 1]$ and $\sigma \in (0, \frac{1}{4}\alpha]$, we have

$$\Sigma_f - \frac{\sigma}{2}(W_h - M_h) \succ 0, \quad W_h - \tau M_h \succ 0. \tag{4.32}$$

Then, by Proposition 4.4, we get $\|\bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|^2 \leq \|\theta^k\|^2$. As a result, we have:

$$\|\theta^{k+1}\| \leq \|\bar{\theta}^{k+1}\| + \|\bar{\theta}^{k+1} - \theta^{k+1}\| = \|\theta^k\| + \|\bar{\theta}^{k+1} - \theta^{k+1}\|. \tag{4.33}$$

Employing Lemma 4.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\bar{\theta}^{k+1} - \theta^{k+1}\|^2 &= \frac{1}{2\tau\sigma}\|\bar{\lambda}^{k+1} - \lambda^{k+1}\|_{M_h}^2 + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|\bar{z}^{k+1} - z^{k+1}\|_{M_h}^2 \\
&= \frac{\tau\sigma}{2}\|\bar{r}^{k+1} - r^{k+1}\|_{M_h}^2 + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|\bar{z}^{k+1} - z^{k+1}\|_{M_h}^2 \\
&\leq \tau\sigma\|\bar{u}^{k+1} - u^{k+1}\|_{M_h}^2 + (\tau\sigma + \frac{\sigma}{2})\|\bar{z}^{k+1} - z^{k+1}\|_{M_h}^2 \\
&\leq (2\tau + 1/2)\sigma\|M_h\|\rho^2\epsilon_k^2 \leq 5/2\sigma\|M_h\|\rho^2\epsilon_k^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

which implies $\|\bar{\theta}^{k+1} - \theta^{k+1}\| \leq \sqrt{5/2\sigma\|M_h\|}\rho\epsilon_k$. Hence, for any $k \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\theta^{k+1}\| &\leq \|\theta^k\| + \sqrt{5/2\sigma\|M_h\|}\rho\epsilon_k \\
&\leq \|\theta^0\| + \sqrt{5/2\sigma\|M_h\|}\rho\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\epsilon_k = \|\theta^0\| + \sqrt{5/2\sigma\|M_h\|}\rho C_1 \equiv \bar{\rho}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

From $\|\bar{\theta}^{k+1}\| \leq \|\theta^k\|$, for any $k \geq 0$, we also have $\|\bar{\theta}^{k+1}\| \leq \bar{\rho}$. Therefore, the sequences $\{\theta^k\}$ and $\{\bar{\theta}^k\}$ are bounded. From the definition of $\{\theta^k\}$ and the fact that $M_h \succ 0$, we can see that the sequences $\{\lambda^k\}$ and $\{z^k\}$ are bounded. Moreover, from updating technique of λ^k, we know $\{u^k\}$ is also bounded. Thus, due to the boundedness of the sequence $\{(u^k, z^k, \lambda^k)\}$, we know the sequence has a subsequence $\{(u^{k_i}, z^{k_i}, \lambda^{k_i}))\}$ which converges to an accumulation point $(\bar{u}, \bar{z}, \bar{\lambda})$. Next we should show that $(\bar{u}, \bar{z}, \bar{\lambda})$ is a KKT point and equal to (u^*, z^*, λ^*).

Again employing Proposition 4.4, we can derive

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\Big(\|\bar{u}^{k+1}-u^*\|_T^2+\frac{\sigma}{2}\|\bar{z}^{k+1}-z^*\|_{W_h-M_h}^2+\frac{\sigma}{2}\|\bar{r}^{k+1}\|_{W_h-\tau M_h}^2+\frac{\sigma}{2}\|\bar{u}^{k+1}-z^k\|_{M_h}^2\Big)\\
\leq&\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(\|\theta^k\|^2-\|\theta^{k+1}\|^2+\|\theta^{k+1}\|^2-\|\bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|^2)\\
\leq&\|\theta^0\|^2+\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\big(\|\theta^{k+1}-\bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|(\|\theta^{k+1}\|+\|\bar{\theta}^{k+1}\|)\big)\\
\leq&\|\theta^0\|^2+2\bar{\rho}\sqrt{5/2\sigma\|M_h\|}\rho C_1<\infty
\end{aligned}\tag{4.36}$$

which means

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{k\to\infty}\|\bar{u}^{k+1}-u^*\|_T=0,\quad \lim_{k\to\infty}\|\bar{z}^{k+1}-z^*\|_{W_h-M_h}=0,\\
\lim_{k\to\infty}\|\bar{r}^{k+1}\|_{W_h-\tau M_h}=0,\quad \lim_{k\to\infty}\|\bar{u}^{k+1}-z^k\|_{M_h}=0\qquad .
\end{aligned}\tag{4.37}$$

Note that $T\succ 0, W_h-M_h\succ 0, W_h-\tau M_h\succ 0$ and $M_h\succ 0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{k\to\infty}\|\bar{u}^{k+1}-u^*\|=0,\quad \lim_{k\to\infty}\|\bar{z}^{k+1}-z^*\|=0,\\
\lim_{k\to\infty}\|\bar{r}^{k+1}\|=0,\quad \lim_{k\to\infty}\|\bar{u}^{k+1}-z^k\|=0.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.38}$$

From the Lemma 4.2, we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u^{k+1}-u^*\|\leq\|\bar{u}^{k+1}-u^*\|+\|u^{k+1}-\bar{u}^{k+1}\|\leq\|\bar{u}^{k+1}-u^*\|+\rho\epsilon_k,\\
\|z^{k+1}-z^*\|\leq\|\bar{z}^{k+1}-z^*\|+\|z^{k+1}-\bar{z}^{k+1}\|\leq\|\bar{z}^{k+1}-z^*\|+\rho\epsilon_k.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.39}$$

From the fact that $\lim_{k\to\infty}\epsilon_k=0$ and (4.38), by taking the limit of both sides of (4.39), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{k\to\infty}\|u^{k+1}-u^*\|=0,\quad \lim_{k\to\infty}\|z^{k+1}-z^*\|=0,\\
\lim_{k\to\infty}\|r^{k+1}\|=0,\quad \lim_{k\to\infty}\|u^{k+1}-z^k\|=0.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.40}$$

Now taking limits for $k_i\to\infty$ on both sides of (4.29a), we have

$$\lim_{k_i\to\infty}(\delta^{k_i}-(M_h\lambda^{k_i}+\sigma M_h(u^{k_i+1}-z^{k_i})))=\nabla f(u^{k_i+1}),$$

which results in

$$-M_h\bar{\lambda}=\nabla f(u^*)$$

Then from (4.28a), we know $\bar{\lambda}=\lambda^*$. At last, to complete the proof, we need to show that λ^* is the limit of the sequence of $\{\lambda^k\}$. From (4.35), we have for any $k>k_i$,

$$\|\theta^{k+1}\|\leq\|\theta^{k_i}\|+\sqrt{5/2\sigma\|M_h\|}\rho\sum_{j=k_i}^{k}\epsilon_j.$$

Since $\lim_{k_i\to\infty}\|\theta^{k_i}\|=0$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\epsilon_k<\infty$, we have that $\lim_{k\to\infty}\|\theta^k\|=0$, which implies

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\|\lambda^{k+1}-\lambda^*\|=0.$$

Hence, we have proved the convergence of the sequence $\{(u^{k+1},z^{k+1},\lambda^{k+1})\}$, which completes the proof of (4.25) in Theorem 4.5. For the proof of (4.26), it is easily to show by the definition of the

sequence $\{(y^k, p^k)\}$, here we omit it.

At last, we establish the proof of (4.27), e.g., **the iteration complexity results in non-ergodic sendse for the sequence generated by the ihADMM.**

Firstly, by the optimality condition (4.29a) and (4.29b) for (u^{k+1}, z^{k+1}), we have

$$\delta^k + (\tau-1)\sigma M_h r^{k+1} - \sigma M_h(z^{k+1}-z^k) = M_h\lambda^{k+1} + \nabla f(u^{k+1}), \tag{4.41a}$$

$$\sigma(W_h - \tau M_h) r^{k+1} \in -M_h\lambda^{k+1} + \partial g(z^{k+1}). \tag{4.41b}$$

By the definition of R_h and denoting $w^{k+1} := (u^{k+1}, z^{k+1}, \lambda^{k+1})$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} R_h(w^{k+1}) &= \|M_h\lambda^{k+1} + \nabla f(u^{k+1})\|^2 + \mathrm{dist}^2(0, -M_h\lambda^{k+1} + \partial g(z^{k+1})) + \|u^{k+1} - z^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\le 2\|\delta^k\|^2 + 2(\tau-1)^2\sigma^2\|M_h\|^2\|r^{k+1}\|^2 + 2\sigma^2\|M_h\|\|z^{k+1} - z^k\|^2_{M_h} \\ &\quad + \sigma^2\|(W_h - \tau M_h)\|^2\|r^{k+1}\|^2 + \|r^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\le 2\|\delta^k\|^2 + 2(\tau-1)^2\sigma^2\|M_h\|^2\|r^{k+1}\|^2 + 4\sigma^2\|M_h\|^2\|u^{k+1} - z^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &\quad + 4\sigma^2\|M_h\|\|u^{k+1} - z^k\|^2_{M_h} + \sigma^2\|W_h - \tau M_h\|^2\|r^{k+1}\|^2 + \|r^{k+1}\|^2 \\ &= 2\|\delta^k\|^2 + \eta\|r^{k+1}\|^2 + 2\sigma^2\|M_h\|\|u^{k+1} - z^k\|^2_{M_h}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.42}$$

where

$$\eta := 2(\tau-1)^2\sigma^2\|M_h\|^2 + 2\sigma^2\|M_h\|^2 + \sigma^2\|W_h - \tau M_h\|^2 + 1.$$

In order to get a upper bound for $R_h(w^{k+1})$, we will use (4.23) in Proposition 4.3. First, by the definition of θ^k and (4.35), for any $k \ge 0$ we can easily have

$$\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\| \le \bar\rho\sqrt{\frac{2\tau\sigma}{\|M_h^{-1}\|}}, \quad \|z^k - z^*\| \le \bar\rho\sqrt{\frac{2}{\sigma\|M_h^{-1}\|}}.$$

Next, we should give a upper bound for $\langle\delta^k, u^{k+1} - u^*\rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\delta^k, u^{k+1} - u^*\rangle &\le \|\delta^k\|(\|u^{k+1} - z^{k+1}\| + \|z^{k+1} - z^*\|) \\ &= \|\delta^k\|\left(\frac{1}{\tau\sigma}\|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k\| + \|z^{k+1} - z^*\|\right) \\ &\le \left(\left(1 + \frac{2}{\sqrt{\tau}}\right)\frac{2\sqrt{2}\bar\rho}{\sqrt{\tau\sigma\|M_h^{-1}\|}}\right)\|\delta^k\| \equiv \bar\eta\|\delta^k\|. \end{aligned} \tag{4.43}$$

Then by the (4.23) in Proposition 4.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\sigma}{2}\|r^{k+1}\|^2_{W_h - \tau M_h} + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|u^{k+1} - z^k\|^2_{M_h}\right) &\le \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(\theta^k - \theta^{k+1}) + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\langle\delta^k, u^{k+1} - u^*\rangle \\ &\le \theta^0 + \bar\eta\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\|\delta^k\| \le \theta^0 + \bar\eta\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\epsilon^k = \theta^0 + \bar\eta C_1. \end{aligned} \tag{4.44}$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\|r^{k+1}\|^2 \le \frac{2(\theta^0 + \bar\eta C_1)}{\sigma\|(W_h - \tau M_h)^{-1}\|}, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\|u^{k+1} - z^k\|^2_{M_h} \le \frac{2(\theta^0 + \bar\eta C_1)}{\sigma}. \tag{4.45}$$

By substituting (4.45) to (4.42), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} R_h(w^{k+1}) &\le 2\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\|\delta\|^2 + \eta\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\|r^{k+1}\|^2 + 2\sigma^2\|M_h\|\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\|u^{k+1}-z^k\|_{M_h}^2 \\ &\le 2\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\epsilon_k^2 + \eta\frac{2(\theta^0+\bar{\eta}C_1)}{\sigma\|(W_h-\tau M_h)^{-1}\|} + 2\sigma^2\|M_h\|\frac{2(\theta^0+\bar{\eta}C_1)}{\sigma} \\ &\le C := 2C_2 + \eta\frac{2(\theta^0+\bar{\eta}C_1)}{\sigma\|(W_h-\tau M_h)^{-1}\|} + 2\sigma^2\|M_h\|\frac{2(\theta^0+\bar{\eta}C_1)}{\sigma}\end{aligned} \tag{4.46}$$

Thus, by Lemma 4.1, we know (4.27) holds. Therefore, combining the obtained global convergence results, we complete the whole proof of the Theorem 4.5. □

4.2 Numerical computation of the u-subproblem of Algorithm 3

4.2.1 Error analysis of the linear system (4.12)

As we know, the linear system (4.12) is a special case of the generalized saddle-point problem, thus some Krylov-based methods could be employed to inexactly solve the linear system. Let (r_1^k, r_2^k) be the residual error vector, that means:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\alpha+\sigma}M_h & K_h \\ -K_h & M_h \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} y^{k+1} \\ u^{k+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\alpha+\sigma}(K_h(\sigma z^k-\lambda^k)+M_h y_d)+r_1 \\ -M_h y_c + r_2 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{4.47}$$

and $\delta^k = (\alpha+\sigma)M_hK_h^{-1}r_1^k + M_hK_h^{-1}M_hK_h^{-1}r_2^k$, thus in the numerical implementation we require

$$\|r_1^k\|_2 + \|r_2^k\|_2 \le \frac{\epsilon_k}{\sqrt{2}\|M_hK_h^{-1}\|_2\max\{\|M_hK_h^{-1}\|_2, \alpha+\sigma\}} \tag{4.48}$$

to guarantee the error vector $\|\delta^k\|_2 \le \epsilon_k$.

4.2.2 An efficient precondition techniques for solving the linear systems

To solve (4.12), in this paper, we use the generalized minimal residual (GMRES) method. In order to speed up the convergence of the GMRES method, the preconditioned variant of modified hermitian and skew-hermitian splitting (PMHSS) preconditioner $\mathcal{P}$ is employed which is introduced in [28]:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{HSS}} = \frac{1}{\gamma}\begin{bmatrix} I & \sqrt{\gamma}I \\ -\sqrt{\gamma}I & \gamma I \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} M_h+\sqrt{\gamma}K_h & 0 \\ 0 & M_h+\sqrt{\gamma}K_h \end{bmatrix}, \tag{4.49}$$

where $\gamma = \alpha+\sigma$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the coefficient matrix of linear system (4.12).

In actual implementations, the action of the preconditioning matrix, when used to precondition the GMRES methods, is realized through solving a sequence of generalized residual equations of the form $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{HSS}}v = r$, where $r = (r_a; r_b) \in \mathbb{R}^{2N_h}$, with $r_a, r_b \in \mathbb{R}^{N_h}$. By making using of the structure of the matrix $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{HSS}}$, we obtain the following procedure for computing the vector v:

Step 1 compute $\hat{r}_a$ and $\hat{r}_b$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{r}_a &= \frac{\gamma}{2}r_a - \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{2}r_b, \\ \hat{r}_b &= \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{2}r_a + \frac{1}{2}r_b.\end{aligned}$$

Step 2 compute v_a and v_b by solving the following linear systerms

$$\begin{aligned}(M_h + \sqrt{\gamma}K_h)v_a &= \hat{r}_a,\\ (M_h + \sqrt{\gamma}K_h)v_b &= \hat{r}_b.\end{aligned}$$

In our numerical experiments, the approximation $\widehat{G}$ corresponding to the matrix $G := M_h + \sqrt{\gamma}K_h$ is implemented by 20 steps of Chebyshev semi-iteration when the parameter γ is small, since in this case the coefficient matrix G is dominated by the mass matrix and 20 steps of Chebyshev semi-iteration is an appropriate approximation for the action of G's inverse. For more details on the Chebyshev semi-iteration method we refer to [29, 30]. Meanwhile, for the large values of γ, the stiffness matrix K_h makes a significant contribution. Hence, a fixed number of Chebyshev semi-iteration is no longer sufficient to approximate the action of G^{-1}. In this case, the way to avoid this difficulty is to approximate the action of G^{-1} with two AMG V-cycles, which obtained by the **amg** operator in the iFEM software package[1].

It is obvious that the PMHSS preconditioner requires the (approximate) solution of two linear systems with coefficient matrix $M_h + \sqrt{\gamma}K_h$ at each iteration. However, if the classical ADMM is employed, we need to solve (4.9) by MINRES with block diagonal preconditioner $\mathcal{P}_{BD}$:

$$\mathcal{P}_{BD} = \begin{bmatrix} M_h & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha M_h + \sigma I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & K_h M_h^{-1} K_h \end{bmatrix} \tag{4.50}$$

which requires at each iteration the (approximate) solution of two linear systems with coefficient matrix K_h in addition to two linear systems involving the mass matrix M_h and the matrix $\alpha M_h + \sigma I$.

4.2.3 Terminal condition

Let ϵ be a given accuracy tolerance. Thus we terminate our ihADMM method when $\eta < \epsilon$, where $\eta = \max\{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, \eta_4, \eta_5\}$, in which

$$\eta_1 = \frac{\|K_h y - M_h u - M_h y_c\|}{1 + \|M_h y_c\|}, \quad \eta_2 = \frac{\|M_h(u - z)\|}{1 + \|u\|}, \quad \eta_3 = \frac{\|M_h(y - y_d) + K_h p\|}{1 + \|M_h y_d\|},$$
$$\eta_4 = \frac{\|\alpha M_h u - M_h p + M_h \lambda\|}{1 + \|u\|}, \quad \eta_5 = \frac{\|z - \Pi_{[a,b]}\,(z + M_h\lambda)\,\|}{1 + \|z\|}.$$

4.3 A two-phase strategy for discrete problems

In this section, we introduce the primal-dual active set (PDAS) method as a Phase-II algorithm to solve problem $(\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h)$. Let $(\bar{y}^*, \bar{u}^*)$ be the optimal solution of $(\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h)$ which can be characterized by the following optimality system that is regarded as a discretized type of (2.13):

$$G(\bar{y}^*, \bar{u}^*, \bar{p}^*, \bar{\mu}^*) = \begin{pmatrix} K_h\bar{y}^* - M_h\bar{u}^* \\ K_h\bar{p}^* + M_h(\bar{y}^* - y_d) \\ \alpha M_h\bar{u}^* - M_h\bar{p}^* + \bar{\mu}^* \\ \bar{\mu}^* - \max(0, \bar{\mu}^* + c(\bar{u}^* - b)) - \min(0, \bar{\mu}^* + c(\bar{u}^* - a)) \end{pmatrix} = 0 \tag{4.51}$$

for any $c > 0$.

Thus, the full numerical scheme of the primal-dual active set method for solving the nonsmooth equation (4.51) is shown in Algorithm 4.

[1]For more details about the iFEM software package, we refer to the website `http://www.math.uci.edu/~chenlong/programming.html`

Algorithm 4: Primal-Dual Active Set (PDAS) method for $(\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h)$

Initialization: Choose y^0, u^0, p^0 and μ^0. Set $k = 0$ and $c > 0$.

Step 1 Determine the following subsets (Active and Inactive sets)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_a^{k+1} &= \{i \in \{1, 2, ..., N_h\} : (\mu^k + c(u^k - a))_i < 0\},\\
\mathcal{A}_b^{k+1} &= \{i \in \{1, 2, ..., N_h\} : (\mu^k + c(u^k - b))_i > 0\},\\
\mathcal{I}^{k+1} &= \{1, 2, ..., N_h\} \backslash (\mathcal{A}_a^{k+1} \cup \mathcal{A}_a^{k+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Step 2 solve the following system

$$\begin{cases}
K_h y^{k+1} - M_h u^{k+1} = 0,\\
K_h p^{k+1} + M_h y^{k+1} = M_h y_d,\\
\alpha M_h u^{k+1} - M_h p^{k+1} + \mu^{k+1} = 0,
\end{cases}$$

where

$$u^{k+1} = \begin{cases} a & \text{on } \mathcal{A}_a^{k+1} \\ b & \text{on } \mathcal{A}_b^{k+1} \end{cases} \qquad \textit{and} \quad \mu^{k+1} = 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{I}^{k+1}$$

Step 3 If a termination criterion is not met, set $k := k + 1$ and go to Step 1

Remark 4.6. *To numerically solve the linear system in step* 2 *of Algorithm* 4*, we partition the control* u *according to the dimension of the sets* $\mathcal{A}_a^{k+1}$*,* $\mathcal{A}_b^{k+1}$ *and* $\mathcal{I}^{k+1}$*, and then attain a reduced system:*

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_h & 0 & K_h \\ 0 & \alpha M_h^{\mathcal{I}^{k+1},\mathcal{I}^{k+1}} & -M_h^{\mathcal{I}^{k+1},:} \\ K_h & -M_h^{:,\mathcal{I}^{k+1}} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y^{k+1} \\ u^{\mathcal{I}^{k+1}} \\ p^{k+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M_h y_d \\ -\alpha(M_h^{\mathcal{I}^{k+1},\mathcal{A}_a^{k+1}} a + M_h^{\mathcal{I}^{k+1},\mathcal{A}_b^{k+1}} b) \\ M_h^{:,\mathcal{A}_a^{k+1}} a + M_h^{:,\mathcal{A}_b^{k+1}} b \end{bmatrix} \tag{4.52}$$

Once this system is solved, we could update the Lagrange multiplier μ *associated with the sets* $\mathcal{A}_a^{k+1}$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_b^{k+1}$ *by*

$$\mu^{\mathcal{A}_b^{k+1}} = M_h^{\mathcal{A}_b^{k+1},:} p^{k+1} - \alpha(M_h^{\mathcal{A}_b^{k+1},\mathcal{I}^{k+1}} u^{\mathcal{I}^{k+1}} + M_h^{\mathcal{A}_b^{k+1},\mathcal{A}_b^{k+1}} b + M_h^{\mathcal{A}_b^{k+1},\mathcal{A}_a^{k+1}} a) \tag{4.53}$$

$$\mu^{\mathcal{A}_a^{k+1}} = M_h^{\mathcal{A}_a^{k+1},:} p^{k+1} - \alpha(M_h^{\mathcal{A}_a^{k+1},\mathcal{I}^{k+1}} u^{\mathcal{I}^{k+1}} + M_h^{\mathcal{A}_a^{k+1},\mathcal{A}_b^{k+1}} b + M_h^{\mathcal{A}_a^{k+1},\mathcal{A}_a^{k+1}} a) \tag{4.54}$$

Evidently, the linear system (4.52) *represents a saddle point system with a* 3×3 *block structure which can be solved by employing some Krylov subspace methods with a good preconditioner. For a general survey of how to precondition saddle point problems we refer to* [31]*. In particular, Rees and Stoll in* [32] *showed that the following block triangular preconditioners can be employed for the solution of saddle point system* (4.52) *with Bramble-Pasciak CG method* [33]*:*

$$\mathcal{P}_{BT} = \begin{bmatrix} A_0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A_1 & 0 \\ -K_h & M_h^{:,\mathcal{I}^{k+1}} & -S_0 \end{bmatrix},$$

In actual numerical implementations, we chose the preconditioners A_0 *and* A_1 *to be* 20 *steps of Chebyshev semi-iteration to represent approximation to* M_h *and* $\alpha M_h^{\mathcal{I}^{k+1},\mathcal{I}^{k+1}}$*, respectively; see* [29, 34]*. And the block* $S_0 := \widehat{K_h} M_h^{-1} \widehat{K_h}$ *represent a good approximation to* $K_h M_h^{-1} K_h$*, in which the approximation* $\widehat{K_h}$ *to* K_h *is set to be two AMG V-cycles obtained by the* ***amg*** *operator in the iFEM software package.*

In addition, let ϵ *be a given accuracy tolerance. Thus we terminate our Phase-II algorithm (PDAS*

method) when $\eta < \epsilon$, *where* $\eta = \max\{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3\}$ *and*

$$\eta_1 = \frac{\|K_h y - M_h u - M_h y_c\|}{1 + \|M_h y_c\|}, \qquad \eta_2 = \frac{\|M_h(y - y_d) + K_h p\|}{1 + \|M_h y_d\|},$$
$$\eta_3 = \frac{\|u - \Pi_{[a,b]}\left((I - \alpha M_h)u + M_h p\right)\|}{1 + \|u\|}.$$

4.4 Algorithms for comparison

In this section, in order to show the high efficiency of our ihADMM and the two-phase strategy, we introduce the details of a globalized version of PDAS as a comparison to solve $(\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h)$. An important issue for the successful application of the PDAS scheme, is the use of a robust line-search method for globalization purposes. In our numerical implementation, the classical Armijo line search schemes is used. Then a globalized version of PDAS with Armijo line search is given.

In addition, as we have mentioned in Section 4, instead of our ihADMM method and PDAS method, one can also apply the classical ADMM method and the linearized ADMM (LADMM) to solve problem $(\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h)$ for the sake of numerical comparison. Thus, in numerical implementation, we will also show the numerical results of the classical ADMM and the LADMM.

5 Numerical Result

In this section, we will use the following example to evaluate the numerical behaviour of our two-phase framework algorithm for the problem $(\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h)$ and verify the theoretical error estimates given in Section 3.

5.1 Algorithmic Details

We begin by describing the algorithmic details which are common to all examples.

Discretization. As show in Section 3, the discretization was carried out using piece-wise linear and continuous finite elements. For the case with domain $\Omega = B_1(0)$, the unit circle in $\subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$, the polyhedral approximation is used. The assembly of mass and the stiffness matrices, as well as the lump mass matrix was left to the iFEM software package.

To present the finite element error estimates results, it is convenient to introduce the experimental order of convergence (EOC), which for some positive error functional $E(h)$ with $h > 0$ is defined as follows: let

$$\mathrm{EOC} := \frac{\log E(h_1) - \log E(h_2)}{\log h_1 - \log h_2}. \tag{5.1}$$

where h_1 and h_2 denote two consecutive mesh sizes. It follows from this definition that if $E(h) = \mathcal{O}(h^\gamma)$ then $\mathrm{EOC} \approx \gamma$. The error functional $E(\cdot)$ investigated in the present section is given by

$$E_2(h) := \|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{5.2}$$

Initialization. For all numerical examples, we choose $u = 0$ as initialization u^0 for all algorithms.

Parameter Setting. For the classical ADMM, the LADMM and our ihADMM, the penalty parameter σ was chosen as $\sigma = 0.1\alpha$. About the step-length τ, we choose $\tau = 1.618$ for the classical ADMM and LADMM, and $\tau = 1$ for our ihADMM. For the PDAS method, the parameter in the active set strategy was chosen as $c = 1$. For the LADMM method, we estimate an approximation for the Lipschitz constant L with a backtracking method.

Terminal Condition. In numerical experiments, we measure the accuracy of an approximate optimal solution by using the corresponding K-K-T residual error for each algorithm. For the purpose of showing the efficiency of ihADMM, we report the numerical results obtained by running the classical ADMM method and the LADMM to compare with the results obtained by ihADMM. In this case,

we terminate all the algorithms when $\eta < 10^{-6}$ with the maximum number of iterations set at 500. Additionally, we also employ our two-phase strategy to obtain more accurate solution. As a comparison, a globalized version of the PDAS algorithm are also shown. In this case, we terminate the our ihADMM when $\eta < 10^{-3}$ to warm-start the PDAS algorithm which is terminated when $\eta < 10^{-11}$. Similarly, we terminate the PDAS algorithm with Armijo line search when $\eta < 10^{-11}$.

Computational environment. All our computational results are obtained by MATLAB Version 8.5(R2015a) running on a computer with 64-bit Windows 7.0 operation system, Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-5500U CPU (2.40GHz) and 8GB of memory.

5.2 Examples

Example 5.1. *[35, Example 3.3]*

$$\begin{cases} \min\limits_{(y,u)\in H_0^1(\Omega)\times L^2(\Omega)} & J(y,u) = \dfrac{1}{2}\|y-y_d\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \dfrac{\alpha}{2}\|u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ \text{s.t.} & -\Delta y = u, \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ & y = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \\ & u \in U_{ad} = \{v(x) | a \le v(x) \le b, \text{a.e on } \Omega\}, \end{cases}$$

Here we consider the problem with $\Omega = B_1(0) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ denoting the unit circle. Furthermore, we set the desired state $y_d = (1-(x_1^2+x_2^2))x_1$, the parameters $\alpha = 0.1$, $a = -0.2$ and $b = 0.2$. In addition, the exact solutions of the problem is unknown in advance. Instead we use the numerical solutions computed on a grid with $h^* = 2^{-10}$ as reference solutions.

An an example, the discretized optimal control u_h with $h = 2^{-6}$ is displayed in Figure 1. In Table 1, we present the error of the control u w.r.t the L^2 norm with respect to the solution on the finest grid ($h^* = 2^{-10}$) and the experimental order of convergence (EOC) for control, which both confirm the error estimate result as shown in Theorem 3.2.

Numerical results for the accuracy of solution, number of iterations and cpu time obtained by our ihADMM, classical ADMM and LADMM methods are shown in Table 1. As a result from Table 1, we can see that our proposed ihADMM is a highly efficient for problem ($\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h$) in obtaining an approximate solution with medium accuracy, which compared to the classical ADMM and the LADMM in terms of in CPU time, especially when the discretization is in a fine level. Furthermore, it should be specially mentioned that the numerical results in terms of iterations illustrate the mesh-independent performance of the ihADMM and the LADMM. However, iterations of the classical ADMM will increase with the refinement of the discretization.

In addition, in order to obtain more accurate solution, we employ our two-phase strategy. The numerical results are shown in Table 2. As a comparison, numerical results obtained by the PDAS with line search are also shown in Table 2 to show the power and the importance of our two-phase framework. It can be observed that our two-phase strategy is faster and more efficient than the PDAS with line search in terms of the iteration numbers and CPU time.



Figure 1: optimal control u_h on the grid with $h = 2^{-6}$.

Table 1: Example 5.1: The convergence behavior of our ihADMM, classical ADMM and LADMM for $(\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h)$. In the table, #dofs stands for the number of degrees of freedom for the control variable on each grid level.

h	#dofs	E_2	EOC	Index	ihADMM	classical ADMM	LADMM
2^{-4}	148	4.09e-3	–	iter	26	44	29
				residual η	9.13e-07	9.91e-07	9.39e-07
				CPU times/s	0.23	0.66	0.28
2^{-5}	635	1.46e-3	1.4858	iter	27	58	34
				residual η	8.21e-07	8.11e-07	8.56e-07
				CPU time/s	0.57	2.32	0.67
2^{-6}	2629	4.82e-4	1.5990	iter	26	76	32
				residual η	7.16e-07	8.10e-07	8.43e-07
				CPU time/s	1.97	9.12	2.79
2^{-7}	10697	1.66e-4	1.5359	iter	25	52	34
				residual η	5.98e-07	9.79e-07	9.85e-07
				CPU time/s	8.57	36.72	14.32
2^{-8}	43153	7.07e-05	1.4638	iter	26	130	34
				residual η	5.97e-07	3.51e-07	6.96e-07
				CPU time/s	55.92	1303.63	82.88
2^{-9}	173345	2.41e-05	1.4810	iter	26	417	35
				residual η	8.57e-07	9.66e-07	9.48e-07
				CPU time/s	588.76	68550.14	1080.24
2^{-10}	694849	–	–	iter	26	500	35
				residual η	7.49e-07	2.20e-05	9.71e-07
				CPU time/s	10335.43	469845.38	15290.49

Table 2: Example 5.1: The convergence behavior of our two-phase strategy, PDAS with line search.

h	#dofs	Index of performance	Two-Phase strategy ihADMM + PDAS	PDAS with line search
2^{-4}	148	iter	8 + 11	35
		residual η	8.84e-4 / 8.15e-12	8.17e-12
		CPU times/s	0.07 + 0.25	0.79
2^{-5}	635	iter	9 + 12	34
		residual η	6.45e-04 / 7.49e-12	7.47e-12
		CPU time/s	0.13 + 0.70	1.98
2^{-6}	2629	iter	8 + 11	35
		residual η	7.99e-04 / 1.51e-12	1.48e-12
		CPU time/s	0.61 + 4.18	13.31
2^{-7}	10697	iter	8 + 12	34
		residual η	6.61e-04 / 4.95e-12	1.52e-12
		CPU time/s	3.14 + 16.52	52.50
2^{-8}	43153	iter	8 + 12	36
		residual η	5.72e-04 / 1.51e-12	1.50e-12
		CPU time/s	23.22 + 77.34	253.18
2^{-9}	173345	iter	8 + 11	34
		residual η	5.62e-04 + 1.29e-12	1.29e-12
		CPU time/s	181.57 + 473.53	1463.63
2^{-10}	694849	iter	8 + 11	34
		residual η	6.00e-04 / 1.59e-12	1.60e-12
		CPU time/s	3180.13 + 7983.61	22855.63

Example 5.2. *[36, Example 4.1]*

$$\begin{cases} \min\limits_{(y,u)\in H_0^1(\Omega)\times L^2(\Omega)} & J(y,u) = \dfrac{1}{2}\|y-y_d\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \dfrac{\alpha}{2}\|u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ \text{s.t.} & -\Delta y = u, \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ & y = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \\ & u \in U_{ad} = \{v(x) | a \le v(x) \le b, \text{a.e on } \Omega\}, \end{cases}$$

Here, we consider the problem with control $u \in L^2(\Omega)$ on the unit square $\Omega = (0,1)^2$ with $a = 0.3$ and $b = 1$. Furthermore, we set the parameters $\alpha = 0.001$ and the desired state $y_d = -4\pi^2\alpha\sin(\pi x)\sin(\pi y) + \mathcal{S}r$, and $r = \min(1, \max(0.3, 2\sin(\pi x)\sin(\pi y)))$, where $\mathcal{S}$ denotes the solution operator associated with $-\Delta$. In addition, from the choice of parameters, it implies that $u \equiv r$ is the unique control solution to the continuous problem.

The exact control and the discretized optimal control on the grid with $h = 2^{-7}$ are presented in Figure 2. The error of the control u w.r.t the L^2-norm and the EOC for control are presented in Table

3. They also confirm that indeed the convergence rate is of order $o(h)$.

Numerical results for the accuracy of solution, number of iterations and cpu time obtained by our ihADMM, classical ADMM and LADMM methods are also shown in Table 3. Experiment results show that the ADMM has evident advantage over the classical ADMM and the APG method in computing time. Furthermore, the numerical results in terms of iteration numbers also illustrate the mesh-independent performance of our ihADMM. In addition, in Table 4, we give the numerical results obtained by our two-phase strategy and the PDAS method with line search. As a result from Table 4, it can be observed that our two-phase strategy outperform the PDAS with line search in terms of the CPU time. These results demonstrate that our ihADMM is highly efficient in obtaining an approximate solution with moderate accuracy. Clearly, numerical results in terms of the accuracy of solution and CPU time demonstrate the efficiency and robustness of our proposed two-phase frame in obtaining accurate solutions.

Table 3: Example 5.2: The convergence behavior of ihADMM, classical ADMM and LADMM for $(\overline{\mathrm{P}}_h)$. In the table, #dofs stands for the number of degrees of freedom for the control variable on each grid level.

h	#dofs	E_2	EOC	Index	ihADMM	classical ADMM	LADMM
$\sqrt{2}/2^4$	225	0.0157	–	iter	24	120	29
				residual η	8.46e-07	9.98e-07	9.81e-07
				CPU times/s	0.28	4.72	0.42
$\sqrt{2}/2^5$	961	5.95e-3	1.3992	iter	23	32	29
				residual η	4.88e-07	7.25e-07	8.37e-07
				CPU time/s	0.85	4.00	1.06
$\sqrt{2}/2^6$	3969	1.89e-3	1.6558	iter	23	45	31
				residual η	8.70e-07	3.34e-07	4.53e-07
				CPU time/s	4.81	22.35	6.94
$\sqrt{2}/2^7$	16129	7.21e-4	1.3898	iter	25	78	32
				residual η	4.85e-08	8.86e-08	1.87e-08
				CPU time/s	21.07	373.25	29.61
$\sqrt{2}/2^8$	65025	2.48e-4	1.5383	iter	24	183	30
				residual η	3.66e-07	7.05e-07	3.15e-07
				CPU time/s	142.54	2669.46	191.29
$\sqrt{2}/2^9$	261121	8.87e-05	1.4841	iter	22	283	31
				residual η	7.57e-07	5.56e-07	4.81e-07
				CPU time/s	1514.26	42758.33	2063.58
$\sqrt{2}/2^{10}$	1046529	3.15e-05	1.4936	iter	24	500	29
				residual η	5.12e-07	4.58e-06	2.87e-07
				CPU time/s	22267.64	545843.68	28304.33



(a) exact control u (b) optimal control u_h

Figure 2: control solution on the grid of size $h = 2^{-7}$

Table 4: Example 5.2: The behavior of two-phase strategy and the PDAS method.

h	#dofs	Index of performance	Two-Phase strategy ihADMM + PDAS	PDAS with line search
$\sqrt{2}/2^4$	225	iter	10 + 10	29
		residual η	8.68e-04 / 1.67e-12	1.67e-12
		CPU times/s	0.15 + 0.80	2.44
$\sqrt{2}/2^5$	961	iter	12 + 9	27
		residual η	6.58e-04 / 3.95e-12	3.95e-12
		CPU time/s	0.56 + 2.36	6.52
$\sqrt{2}/2^6$	3969	iter	11 + 8	30
		residual η	8.24e-04 / 5.73e-12	5.73e-12
		CPU time/s	2.84 + 8.14	26.99
$\sqrt{2}/2^7$	16129	iter	11 + 10	29
		residual η	8.91e-04 / 1.42e-12	1.41e-12
		CPU time/s	12.70 + 48.06	143.79
$\sqrt{2}/2^8$	65025	iter	10 + 12	31
		residual η	9.90e-04 / 8.26e-13	8.25e-13
		CPU time/s	83.14 + 225.36	757.71
$\sqrt{2}/2^9$	261121	iter	11 + 10	30
		residual η	6.57e-04 / 2.55e-12	2.55e-12
		CPU time/s	887.38 + 1886.33	4629.40
$\sqrt{2}/2^{10}$	1046529	iter	11 + 10	31
		residual η	9.25e-04 / 1.04e-13	1.04e-13
		CPU time/s	10206.22 + 12927.28	38760.16

6 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have designed a two-phase method for solving the optimal control problems with box control constraints. By taking advantage of inherent structures of the problem, in Phase-I, we proposed an inexact heterogeneous ADMM (ihADMM) to solve discretized problems. Furthermore, theoretical results on the global convergence as well as the iteration complexity results $o(1/k)$ in non-ergodic sense for ihADMM were established. Moreover, an implementable inexactness criteria was used which allow the accuracy of the generated ihADMM to be easily implementable. Moreover, in order to obtain more accurate solution, in Phase-II taking the advantage of the local superlinear convergence of the primal dual active set method, the PDAS method is used as a postprocessor of the ihADMM. Numerical results demonstrated the efficiency of our ihADMM and the two-phase strategy.

A Proof of Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.4

Before giving two qusi-descent properties: e.g., the proof of Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.4, we first introduce the following two basic identities:

$$\langle x, y\rangle_Q = \frac{1}{2}(\|x\|_Q^2 + \|y\|_Q^2 - \|x-y\|_Q^2) = \frac{1}{2}(\|x+y\|_Q^2 - \|x\|_Q^2 - \|y\|_Q^2) \tag{A.1}$$

$$\langle x-x', y-y'\rangle_Q = \frac{1}{2}(\|x+y\|_Q^2 + \|x'+y'\|_Q^2 - \|x+y'\|_Q^2 - \|x'+y\|_Q^2) \tag{A.2}$$

which hold for any x, y, x', y' in the same Euclidean space and a self-adjoint positive semidefinite linear operator Q. The two identities would be frequently used in proof of Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.4.

Proof. Based on the optimality condition (4.29a) and (4.29b) for (u^{k+1}, z^{k+1}) and the optimality condition (4.28a) and (4.28b) for (u^*, z^*), let $u_1 = u^{k+1}, u_2 = u^*, z_1 = z^{k+1}$ and $z_2 = z^*$ in (4.17) and (4.18), respectively, we are able to derive that

$$\langle \delta^k - (M_h\lambda^k + \sigma M_h(u^{k+1} - z^k)) + M_h\lambda^*, u^{k+1} - u^*\rangle \geq \|u^{k+1} - u^*\|_{\Sigma_f}^2, \tag{A.3}$$

$$\langle M_h\lambda^k + \sigma W_h(u^{k+1} - z^k)) - M_h\lambda^*, z^{k+1} - z^*\rangle \geq \frac{\sigma}{2}\|z^{k+1} - z^*\|_{W_h}^2. \tag{A.4}$$

Adding (A.3) and (A.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle \delta^k, u^{k+1} - u^*\rangle - \langle \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1} - \lambda^*, M_h r^{k+1}\rangle - \sigma\langle M_h(z^{k+1} - z^k), u^{k+1} - u^*\rangle \\ &+ \langle r^{k+1}, (W_h - M_h)(z^{k+1} - z^*)\rangle \geq \|u^{k+1} - u^*\|_{\Sigma_f}^2 + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|z^{k+1} - z^*\|_{W_h}^2,\end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

where we have used the fact that $\lambda^k + \sigma(u^{k+1} - z^k) = \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1} + \sigma(z^{k+1} - z^k)$ and $u^* = z^*$. Next, we rewrite the last three terms on the left-hand side of (A.5). First, by (A.1), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \lambda^* - \tilde{\lambda}^{k+1}, M_h r^{k+1}\rangle &= \langle \lambda^* - \lambda^k - \sigma r^{k+1}, M_h r^{k+1}\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\tau\sigma}\langle \lambda^* - \lambda^k, M_h(\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^k)\rangle - \sigma\|r^{k+1}\|_{M_h}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2\tau\sigma}(\|\lambda^k - \lambda^*\|_{M_h}^2 - \|\lambda^{k+1} - \lambda^*\|_{M_h}^2) + \frac{(\tau-2)\sigma}{2}\|r^{k+1}\|_{M_h}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

Second, by employing (A.2) and $u^* = z^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma\langle M_h(z^{k+1} - z^k), u^* - u^{k+1}\rangle =& \frac{\sigma}{2}\|z^k - z^*\|_{M_h}^2 + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|r^{k+1}\|_{M_h}^2 \\ &- \frac{\sigma}{2}\|z^{k+1} - z^*\|_{M_h}^2 - \frac{\sigma}{2}\|u^{k+1} - z^k\|_{M_h}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

Third, by Proposition 3.3, we know $W_h - M_h$ is a symmetric positive definite matrix. Then using (A.1) and $u^* = z^*$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle r^{k+1}, (W_h - M_h)(z^{k+1} - z^*)\rangle \\ =&\langle u^{k+1} - z^{k+1}, (W_h - M_h)(z^{k+1} - z^*)\rangle \\ =&\frac{\sigma}{2}\|u^{k+1} - u^*\|^2_{W_h - M_h} - \frac{\sigma}{2}\|z^{k+1} - z^*\|^2_{W_h - M_h} - \frac{\sigma}{2}\|r^{k+1}\|^2_{W_h - M_h}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.8}$$

Then, substituting (A.6), (A.7) and (A.8) into (A.5), we can get the required inequality (4.23). This completes the proof of Proposition 4.3. For the proof of Proposition 4.4, by substituting $\bar{u}^{k+1}$ and $\bar{z}^{k+1}$ for u^{k+1} and z^{k+1} in the proof of Proposition 4.3, we can get the assertion of this proposition. □

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Dr. Long Chen for the FEM package iFEM [37] in Matlab and also would like to thank the colleagues for their valuable suggestions that led to improvement in the paper.

References

[1] Hinze M. A variational discretization concept in control constrained optimization: the linear-quadratic case. *Computational Optimization and Applications* 2005; **30**(1):45–61.

[2] Falk RS. Approximation of a class of optimal control problems with order of convergence estimates. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 1973; **44**(1):28–47.

[3] Geveci T. On the approximation of the solution of an optimal control problem governed by an elliptic equation. *RAIRO-Analyse numérique* 1979; **13**(4):313–328.

[4] Casas E, Tröltzsch F. Error estimates for linear-quadratic elliptic control problems. *Analysis and optimization of differential systems*. Springer, 2003; 89–100.

[5] Meyer C, Rösch A. Superconvergence properties of optimal control problems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 2004; **43**(3):970–985.

[6] Arada N, Casas E, Tröltzsch F. Error estimates for the numerical approximation of a semilinear elliptic control problem. *Computational Optimization and Applications* 2002; **23**(2):201–229.

[7] Casas E. Using piecewise linear functions in the numerical approximation of semilinear elliptic control problems. *Advances in Computational Mathematics* 2007; **26**(1-3):137–153.

[8] Rösch A. Error estimates for linear-quadratic control problems with control constraints. *Optimization Methods and Software* 2006; **21**(1):121–134.

[9] Bergounioux M, Kunisch K. Primal-dual strategy for state-constrained optimal control problems. *Computational Optimization and Applications* 2002; **22**(2):193–224.

[10] Ulbrich M. Semismooth newton methods for operator equations in function spaces. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 2002; **13**(3):805–841.

[11] Hintermüller M, Ulbrich M. A mesh-independence result for semismooth newton methods. *Mathematical Programming* 2004; **101**(1):151–184.

[12] Blumensath T, Davies ME. Iterative thresholding for sparse approximations. *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications* 2008; **14**(5-6):629–654.

[13] Jiang K, Sun D, Toh KC. An inexact accelerated proximal gradient method for large scale linearly constrained convex sdp. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 2012; **22**(3):1042–1064.

[14] Beck A, Teboulle M. A fast iterative shrinkage-thresholding algorithm for linear inverse problems. *SIAM journal on imaging sciences* 2009; **2**(1):183–202.

[15] Sun D, Toh KC, Yang L. An efficient inexact abcd method for least squares semidefinite programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 2016; **26**(2):1072–1100.

[16] Boyd S, Parikh N, Chu E, Peleato B, Eckstein J. Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 2011; **3**(1):1–122.

[17] Chen L, Sun D, Toh KC. An efficient inexact symmetric gauss–seidel based majorized admm for high-dimensional convex composite conic programming. *Mathematical Programming* 2015; :1–34.

[18] Li X, Sun D, Toh KC. A schur complement based semi-proximal admm for convex quadratic conic programming and extensions. *Mathematical Programming* 2016; **155**(1-2):333–373.

[19] Fazel M, Pong TK, Sun D, Tseng P. Hankel matrix rank minimization with applications to system identification and realization. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* 2013; **34**(3):946–977.

[20] Glowinski R, Marroco A. Sur l'approximation, par éléments finis d'ordre un, et la résolution, par pénalisation-dualité d'une classe de problèmes de dirichlet non linéaires. *Revue française d'automatique, informatique, recherche opérationnelle. Analyse numérique* 1975; **9**(2):41–76.

[21] Gabay D, Mercier B. A dual algorithm for the solution of nonlinear variational problems via finite element approximation. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications* 1976; **2**(1):17–40.

[22] Kinderlehrer D, Stampacchia G. *An introduction to variational inequalities and their applications*, vol. 31. Siam, 1980.

[23] Ng MK, Wang F, Yuan X. Inexact alternating direction methods for image recovery. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 2011; **33**(4):1643–1668.

[24] Hintermüller M, Ito K, Kunisch K. The primal-dual active set strategy as a semismooth newton method. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 2002; **13**(3):865–888.

[25] Ulbrich M. Nonsmooth newton-like methods for variational inequalities and constrained optimization problems in function spaces. PhD Thesis, Habilitation thesis, Fakultät für Mathematik, Technische Universität München 2002.

[26] Wathen A. Realistic eigenvalue bounds for the galerkin mass matrix. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis* 1987; **7**(4):449–457.

[27] Lin Z, Liu R, Su Z. Linearized alternating direction method with adaptive penalty for low-rank representation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2011; 612–620.

[28] Bai ZZ, Benzi M, Chen F, Wang ZQ. Preconditioned mhss iteration methods for a class of block two-by-two linear systems with applications to distributed control problems. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis* 2013; **33**(1):343–369.

[29] Rees T, Dollar HS, Wathen AJ. Optimal solvers for pde-constrained optimization. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 2010; **32**(1):271–298.

[30] Wathen AJ, Rees T. Chebyshev semi-iteration in preconditioning for problems including the mass matrix. *Electronic Transactions on Numerical Analysis* 2009; **34**(125-135):S22.

[31] Benzi M, Golub GH, Liesen J. Numerical solution of saddle point problems. *Acta numerica* 2005; **14**:1–137.

[32] Rees T, Stoll M. Block-triangular preconditioners for pde-constrained optimization. *Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications* 2010; **17**(6):977–996.

[33] Bramble JH, Pasciak JE. A preconditioning technique for indefinite systems resulting from mixed approximations of elliptic problems. *Mathematics of Computation* 1988; **50**(181):1–17.

[34] Stoll M, Wathen A. Preconditioning for active set and projected gradient methods as semi-smooth newton methods for pde-constrained optimization with control constraints. *Not specified* 2009; .

[35] Hinze M, Pinnau R, Ulbrich M, Ulbrich S. *Optimization with PDE constraints*, vol. 23. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.

[36] Hinze M, Vierling M. Variational discretization and semi-smooth newton methods; implementation, convergence and globalization in pde constrained optimization with control constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0912.0488* 2009; .

[37] Chen L. ifem: an innovative finite element methods package in matlab. *Preprint, University of Maryland* 2008; .